## **United States Court of Appeals FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

\_\_\_\_\_

1	No. 01-38	25WA
Tammy J. Heim,	*	
Appellant,	* * * *	On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas.
Jo Anne B. Barnhart, Commission Social Security Administration,	* ner, * * *	[Not To Be Published]
Appellee.	*	

Submitted: August 7, 2002 Filed: August 13, 2002

\_\_\_\_\_

Before BOWMAN, RICHARD S. ARNOLD, and BYE, Circuit Judges.

## PER CURIAM.

Tammy Heim claims she is entitled to disability insurance benefits. The Commissioner, acting through an administrative law judge (ALJ), found that benefits should be denied. On review, the District Court<sup>1</sup> upheld the ALJ's decision. Ms.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Hon. H. Franklin Waters, late a United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, adopting the report and recommendation of the Hon. Beverly Stites Jones, United States Magistrate Judge.

Heim appeals, claiming that the ALJ made at least eight errors. We affirm the denial of benefits. There is substantial evidence to support the decision of the Commissioner.

Ms. Heim alleges disability from back and hip pain caused by a car accident in 1996 and depression. The ALJ found Ms. Heim's back pain to be a severe impairment, but that her depression was a nonsevere impairment. On appeal, Ms. Heim argues that the ALJ incorrectly evaluated her mental impairment. We disagree. The medical assessments by both government psychologists show only minimal mental limitations. The reports from the Ozark Counseling Center, where Ms. Heim sporadically sought mental-health treatment, do not indicate anything other than a diagnosis of adjustment disorder. Ms. Heim has failed to show that this impairment was anything other than a slight abnormality that did not significantly limit any basic work activity. Substantial evidence supported the ALJ's determination that Ms. Heim's alleged mental disorder was not severe.

Ms. Heim alleges numerous other errors, including that the hypothetical question asked to the vocational expert was inaccurate, that the ALJ did not give specific substantial reasons based on medical evidence for finding Ms. Heim's subjective complaints not fully credible, and that Ms. Heim's residual functional capacity was incorrectly determined. Having carefully reviewed the record, we determine that the ALJ did not err in these matters. Ms. Heim's other contentions are without merit.

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the District Court.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.